



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/863,419	05/24/2001	William D. Norcott	50277-1005	9399
7590	10/06/2005		EXAMINER	
DITTHAVONG & CARLSON, P.C. 10507 Braddock Rd Suite A Fairfax, VA 22032			ALI, MOHAMMAD	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2166	
			DATE MAILED: 10/06/2005	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	09/863,419	NORCOTT, WILLIAM D.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Mohammad Ali	2167

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 06 July 2005.
- 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1 and 3-10 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 2 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1 and 3-10 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1. This communication is in response to the amendment filed on 01/31/05.

Claims 1, 3-10 are pending in this Office Action.

Response to Arguments

2. After further search and a thorough examination of the present application claims 1, 3-10 remain rejected.

Applicants' arguments with respect to claims 1, 3-10 have been considered, but they are not deemed to be persuasive.

First, In response to the applicant's arguments regarding provisional Double Patenting.

Examiner respectfully submits that the Provisional Double Patenting rejection is proper because adding/deleting limitations of instant application remaining elements perform same functions as before, as discussed in the details Office Action. Therefore DP rejections is sustained.

Second, Applicant's argue that Norcott and Rauer do not teach 'executing a database statement to extract, from a recovery log, change data indicating at least one modification that has been performed to a source object'.

In response to applicant's arguments, the Examiner respectfully submits that in particular, Norcott teaches this limitation as, new data for refresh processing purposes, the server process deletes [extract] the ROWID range from the ROWID range table. Updates a redo log to indicate the changes made to the range table ensures that identification of the new data can be recovered in the event of database crash (see col.

6, lines 29-31 and col. 5, lines 59-61, Norcott); updates a redo log to indicate the changes made to the range table (see col. 5, lines 59-60, Norcott); Norcott does not explicitly indicate the claimed "statement to extract". Rauer remedy such kinds of deficiency by teaching the connector is a grouping mechanism for extraction statements and a specification for input and output data stores (see col. 19, lines 22-24, Rauer). It would have been obvious to one ordinary skill in the data processing art, at the time of the present invention, to combine the teachings of the cited references because the statement to extract of Rauer's teachings would have allowed to Norcott's system to create databases, loading and accessing data in the databases as suggested by Ruer, see col. 1, lines 46-47. Further, statement to extract as taught by Rauer improves to perform set of commands to execute the creation of the aggregate tables (see col. 3, lines 19-20, Rauer).

In response to applicant's argument that there is no suggestion to combine the references, the examiner recognizes that obviousness can only be established by combining or modifying the teachings of the prior art to produce the claimed invention where there is some teaching, suggestion, or motivation to do so found either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art. See *In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071, 5 USPQ2d 1596 (Fed. Cir. 1988) and *In re Jones*, 958 F.2d 347, 21 USPQ2d 1941 (Fed. Cir. 1992).

Examiner is entitled to give claim limitations their broadest reasonable interpretation in light of the specification.

Interpretation of Claims-Broadest Reasonable Interpretation

During patent examination, the pending claims must be ‘given the broadest reasonable interpretation consistent with the specification.’ Applicant always has the opportunity to amend the claims during prosecution and broad interpretation by the examiner reduces the possibility that the claim, once issued, will be interpreted more broadly than is justified. *In re Prater*, 162 USPQ 541,550-51 (CCPA 1969).

Reference is made to MPEP 2144.01 - Implicit Disclosure

“[I]n considering the disclosure of a reference, it is proper to take into account not only specific teachings of the reference but also the inferences which one skilled in the art would reasonably be expected to draw therefrom.” *In re Preda*, 401 F.2d 825, 826, 159 USPQ 342, 344 (CCPA 1968)

Subsequent to an analysis of the claims it was revealed that a number of limitations recited in the claims belong in the prior art and thus encompassed and/or implicitly disclosed in the reference (s) applied and cited. It is logical for the examiner to focus on the limitations that are “crux of the invention” and not involve a lot of energy and time for the things that are not central to the invention, but peripheral. The examiner is aware of the duties to address each and every element of claims, however, it is also important that a person prosecuting a patent application before the Office or an stakeholders of patent granting process make effort to understand the level of one of ordinary skill in the (data processing) art or the level one of skilled in the (data processing) art, as encompassed by the applied and cited references. The administrative convenience derived from such a cooperation between the attorneys and examiners benefits the Office as well the patentee.

In view of the above, the examiner contends that all limitations as recited in the claims have been addressed in this Action.

For the above reasons, Examiner believed that rejection of the last Office action was proper.

In response to applicant's argument, to combine the references, the examiner recognizes that obviousness can only be established by combining or modifying the teachings of the prior art to produce the claimed invention where there is some teaching, suggestion, or motivation to do so found either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art. See *In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071, 5 USPQ2d 1596 (Fed. Cir. 1988) and *In re Jones*, 958 F.2d 347, 21 USPQ2d 1941 (Fed. Cir. 1992).

"Test of obviousness is not whether features of secondary reference may be bodily incorporated into primary reference's structure, nor whether claimed invention is expressly suggested in any one or all of references; rather, test is what combined teachings of references would have suggested to those of ordinary skill in art."

In re Keller, Terry, and Davies, 208 USPQ 871 (CCPA 1981).

"Reason, suggestion, or motivation to combine two or more prior art references in single invention may come from references themselves, from knowledge of those skilled in art that certain references or disclosures in references are known to be of interest in particular field, or from nature of problem to be solved;" *Pro-Mold and Tool Co. v. Great Lakes Plastics Inc.* U.S. Court of Appeals Federal Circuit 37 USPQ2d 1626 Decided February 7, 1996 Nos. 95-1171, - 1181

"[q]uestion is whether there is something in prior art as whole to suggest desirability, and thus obviousness, of making combination." *Lindemann Maschinenfabrik GMBH v. American Hoist and Derrick Company et al.* U.S. Court of Appeals Federal Circuit 221 USPQ 481 Decided Mar. 21, 1984 No 83-1178.

Third/Final, Applicant's argue that Norcott and Rauer do not teach 'storing the change data from the recovery log in a database object, other than the source object, wherein the database object includes a change table'

In response to applicant's arguments, the Examiner respectfully submits that in particular, Norcott teaches this limitation as stated above and the start and end ROWID values are database objects and stored in step 406, (see col. 5, lines 57-67, Fig. 4, Norcott); the server process updates a redo log to indicate the changes made to the range table, (see col. 5, lines 54-55, Norcott).

Hence, Applicants' arguments do not distinguish over the claimed invention over the prior art of record.

In light of the foregoing arguments, the 103/DP rejections are hereby sustained.

Double Patenting

3. The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. See *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and, *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).
A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent is shown to be commonly owned with this application. See 37 CFR 1.130(b).

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

Claims 1, 3-6 provisionally rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-6 of copending Application No. 10/435,703. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because they are substantially similar in scope and they use the same limitations.

Claims 1-6 of the 10/435,703 reference recites all the elements of claims 1, 3-6 of the instant application 09/863,419. Claims 1-6 of the 10/435,703 reference also includes additional element that are not recited in the instant claims.

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to omit the additional elements of claims 1-6 to arrive at the claims 1, 3-6 of the instant application because the person would have realized that the remaining element would perform the same functions as before. "Omissions of element and its function in combination is obvious expedient if the remaining elements perform same functions as before." See *In re Karlson* (CCPA) 136 USPQ 184, decide Jan 16, 1963, App. No. 6857, U. S. Court of Customs and Patent Appeals.

The following table shows the claims in 09/863,419 that are rejected by corresponding claims in 10/435,703.

Claims Comparison Table

	09/863,419	10/435,703
Claims	1	1

3	3
4	4
5	5
6	6

This is a provisional obviousness-type double patenting rejection because the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claims 1, 3-10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over William D. Norcott ('Norcott' hereinafter), USP, 5,848,405 in view of Rauer et al. ('Rauer' hereinafter), USP, 6,161,103.

With respect to claim 1,

Norcott teaches a method for change data capture (see col. 1, lines 64 to col. 2, line 1), comprising the steps of:

executing a database statement (see col. 6, lines 54-55) to extract from a recovery log (new data for refresh processing purposes, the server process deletes

[extract] the ROWID range from the ROWID range table. Updates a redo log to indicate the changes made to the range table ensures that identification of the new data can be recovered in the event of database crash, see col. 6, lines 29-31 and col. 5, lines 59-61, Norcott), change data indicating at least one modification that has been performed to a source object (updates a redo log to indicate the changes made to the range table, see col. 5, lines 59-60, Norcott); and

storing the change data from the recovery log in a database object, other than the source object (the start and end ROWID values are database objects and stored in step 406, see col. 5, lines 57-67, Fig. 4, Norcott), wherein the database object includes a change table (the server process updates a redo log to indicate the changes made to the range table, see col. 5, lines 54-55, Norcott).

Norcott does not explicitly indicate the claimed "statement to extract".

Rauer discloses claimed staging system (the connector is a grouping mechanism for extraction statements and a specification for input and output data stores, see col. 19, lines 22-24, Rauer).

It would have been obvious to one ordinary skill in the data processing art, at the time of the present invention, to combine the teachings of the cited references because the statement to extract of Rauer's teachings would have allowed to Norcott's system to create databases, loading and accessing data in the databases as suggested by Ruer, see col. 1, lines 46-47. Further, statement to extract as taught by Rauer improves to perform set of commands to execute the creation of the aggregate tables (see col. 3, lines 19-20, Rauer).

Claim 6 has same subject matter as of claim 1 except "a computer-readable medium bearing instructions for change data capture, said instructions arranged, when executed, to cause one or more processors to perform the steps of a method" and Norcott teaches as queries are processed by computer system 100 in response to processor 102 executing sequences of instructions contained in memory 104 and the instructions can read into memory 104 from another computer-readable medium, such as data storage device. Execution of the sequences of instructions contained in memory 104 causes processor 102 to perform the process (see col. 3, lines 20-28, Norcott) and essentially rejected for the same reasons as discussed above.

Norcott does not explicitly indicate the claimed "statement to extract".

Rauer discloses claimed staging system (the connector is a grouping mechanism for extraction statements and a specification for input and output data stores, see col. 19, lines 22-24, Rauer).

It would have been obvious to one ordinary skill in the data processing art, at the time of the present invention, to combine the teachings of the cited references because the statement to extract of Rauer's teachings would have allowed to Norcott's system to create databases, loading and accessing data in the databases as suggested by Ruer, see col. 1, lines 46-47. Further, statement to extract as taught by Rauer improves to perform set of commands to execute the creation of the aggregate tables (see col. 3, lines 19-20, Rauer).

As to claim 3,

Norcott teaches renaming a source column into a change column (the server process updates a redo log to indicate the changes made to the range table. Since table has been changed columns and rows automatically changed, see col. 5, lines 54-55 and col. 7, lines 3-6, Norcott).

Norcott does not explicitly indicate claimed change column.

Rauer discloses claimed change column (slowly changing dimension semantic type and semantic type are an insert dimension and an index dimension adaptive template. Each adaptive template has a corresponding set of pseudo-SQL statements. During the semantic template conversion this pseudo-SQL will be transformed into real SQL source code. This is done by converting the pseudo-SQL tokens into actualdimension column names, etc. The column names and table names are derived from the schema definitions, see col. 24, lines 4-12, Rauer).

It would have been obvious to one ordinary skill in the data processing art, at the time of the present invention, to combine the teachings of the cited references because the changecolumn of Rauer's teachings would have allowed to Norcett's system to create databases, loading and accessing data in the databases as suggested by Ruer, see col. 1, lines 46-47. Further, change column as taught by Rauer improves to perform set of commands to execute the creation of the aggregate tables (see col. 3, lines 19-20, Rauer).

As to claim 4,

Norcott teaches generating the database statement to extract the change data from the recovery log and further to store the change data in the database object (If the

new data records are stored entirely within a single group of data records having a contiguous sequence of ROWIDs, then the summary refresh process is completed after the server process deletes [extract] the ROWID range from the ROWID range table, see col. 6, lines 27-32 and lines 50-58, Norcott).

As to claim 5,

Norcott teaches shipping the recovery log from an on-line transaction processing (OLTP) system (The source of the data is an online transaction processing (OLTP) database and OLTP databases provide a mechanism for exporting [shipping] data from the database into a static file, see col. 4, lines 20-25, Norcott).

Norcott does not explicitly indicate the claimed "staging system".

Rauer discloses claimed staging system (SQL statements are issued to the source system and the results are loaded into the staging tables. The staging tables had been created as a result of block. Once the staging tables have been loaded, the data can then be moved into the datamart, see col. 10, lines 49-53, Rauer).

It would have been obvious to one ordinary skill in the data processing art, at the time of the present invention, to combine the teachings of the cited references because the staging system of Rauer's teachings would have allowed to Norcott's system to create databases, loading and accessing data in the databases as suggested by Ruer, see col. 1, lines 46-47. Further, staging system as taught by Rauer improves to perform set of commands to execute the creation of the aggregate tables (see col. 3, lines 19-20, Rauer).

With respect to claim 7,

Norcott teaches a method of change data capture (see col. 1, lines 64 to col. 2, line 1), comprising the steps of:

shipping a recovery log (Updates a redo log to indicate the changes made to the range table ensures that identification of the new data can be recovered in the event of database crash, see col. 5, lines 59-61, Norcott) from an on-line transaction processing (OLTP) system (The source of the data is an online transaction processing (OLTP) database and OLTP databases provide a mechanism for exporting [shipping] data from the database into a static file, see col. 4, lines 20-25, Norcott); and

Norcott teaches performing the steps (see col. 5, lines 59-61) of:

extracting change data from a recovery log (new data for refresh processing purposes, the server process deletes [extract] the ROWID range from the ROWID range table. Updates a redo log to indicate the changes made to the range table ensures that identification of the new data can be recovered in the event of database crash, see col. 6, lines 29-31 and col. 5, lines 59-61, Norcott); and

storing the change data from the recovery log in a database object (the start and end ROWID values are database objects and stored in step 406, see col. 5, lines 58-66, Fig. 4, Norcott), said change data indicating at least one modification that has been performed to a source object (updates a redo log to indicate the changes made to the range table, see col. 5, lines 59-60, Norcott).

Norcott does not explicitly indicate the claimed "staging system".

Rauer discloses claimed staging system (SQL statements are issued to the source system and the results are loaded into the staging tables. The staging tables had

been created as a result of block. Once the staging tables have been loaded, the data can then be moved into the datamart, see col. 10, lines 49-53, Rauer).

It would have been obvious to one ordinary skill in the data processing art, at the time of the present invention, to combine the teachings of the cited references because the staging system of Rauer's teachings would have allowed to Norcott's system to create databases, loading and accessing data in the databases as suggested by Ruer, see col. 1, lines 46-47. Further, staging system as taught by Rauer improves to perform set of commands to execute the creation of the aggregate tables (see col. 3, lines 19-20, Rauer).

Norcott does not explicitly indicate the claimed "statement to extract".

Rauer discloses claimed staging system (the connector is a grouping mechanism for extraction statements and a specification for input and output data stores, see col. 19, lines 22-24, Rauer).

It would have been obvious to one ordinary skill in the data processing art, at the time of the present invention, to combine the teachings of the cited references because the statement to extract of Rauer's teachings would have allowed to Norcott's system to create databases, loading and accessing data in the databases as suggested by Ruer, see col. 1, lines 46-47. Further, statement to extract as taught by Rauer improves to perform set of commands to execute the creation of the aggregate tables (see col. 3, lines 19-20, Rauer).

With respect to claim 8,

Norcott teaches a method of change data capture (see col. 1, lines 64 to col. 2, line 1), comprising the steps of:

shipping a recovery log (Updates a redo log to indicate the changes made to the range table ensures that identification of the new data can be recovered in the event of database crash, see col. 5, lines 59-61, Norcott) from an on-line transaction processing (OLTP) system (The source of the data is an online transaction processing (OLTP) database and OLTP databases provide a mechanism for exporting [shipping] data from the database into a static file, see col. 4, lines 20-25); and

Norcott teaches performing (see col. 1, lines 6-8) the steps of:

registering the recovery log with a log viewer (Updates a redo log to indicate the changes made to the range table ensures that identification of the new data can be recovered in the event of database crash, see col. 5, lines 59-61, Norcott);

generating a SQL statement to extract the change data from the recovery log (After all the new records have been added to the "sales" table it is possible to identify the new records by using the ROWID range table, for example by processing the SQL select statement:

SELECT*FROM sales

WHERE (ROWID>=X) AND (ROWID<=Y)

The summary refresh process can access the new data by processing such a select statement after obtaining the values of x and y from the ROWID range table, see col. 6, lines 50-58, Norcott); and

executing the SQL statement (see col. 6, lines 50-55, Norcott), thereby extracting the change data from the recovery log via the log viewer (new data for refresh processing purposes, the server process deletes [extract] the ROWID range from the ROWID range table. Updates a redo log to indicate the changes made to the range table ensures that identification of the new data can be recovered in the event of database crash, see col. 6, lines 29-31 and col. 5, lines 59-61, Norcott) and storing the change data from the recovery log in a change table (the start and end ROWID values are database objects and stored in step 406, see col. 5, lines 58-66, Fig. 4, Norcott), said change data indicating at least one modification that has been performed to a source object (updates a redo log to indicate the changes made to the range table, see col. 5, lines 59-60, Norcott).

Norcott does not explicitly indicate the claimed "staging system".

Rauer discloses claimed staging system (SQL statements are issued to the source system and the results are loaded into the staging tables. The staging tables had been created as a result of block. Once the staging tables have been loaded, the data can then be moved into the datamart, see col. 10, lines 49-53, Rauer).

It would have been obvious to one ordinary skill in the data processing art, at the time of the present invention, to combine the teachings of the cited references because the staging system of Rauer's teachings would have allowed to Norcott's system to create databases, loading and accessing data in the databases as suggested by Ruer, see col. 1, lines 46-47. Further, staging system as taught by Rauer improves to perform

set of commands to execute the creation of the aggregate tables (see col. 3, lines 19-20, Rauer).

Norcott does not explicitly indicate the claimed "statement to extract".

Rauer discloses claimed staging system (the connector is a grouping mechanism for extraction statements and a specification for input and output data stores, see col. 19, lines 22-24, Rauer).

It would have been obvious to one ordinary skill in the data processing art, at the time of the present invention, to combine the teachings of the cited references because the statement to extract of Rauer's teachings would have allowed to Norcott's system to create databases, loading and accessing data in the databases as suggested by Ruer, see col. 1, lines 46-47. Further, statement to extract as taught by Rauer improves to perform set of commands to execute the creation of the aggregate tables (see col. 3, lines 19-20, Rauer).

As to claim 9,

Norcott teaches renaming a source column into a change column (the server process updates a redo log to indicate the changes made to the range table. Since table has been changed columns and rows automatically changed, see col. 5, lines 54-55 and col. 7, lines 3-6, Norcott).

Norcott does not explicitly indicate claimed change column.

Rauer discloses claimed change column (slowly changing dimension semantic type and semantic type are an insert dimension and an index dimension adaptive template. Each adaptive template has a corresponding set of pseudo-SQL statements.

During the semantic template conversion this pseudo-SQL will be transformed into real SQL source code. This is done by converting the pseudo-SQL tokens into actual dimension column names, etc. The column names and table names are derived from the schema definitions, see col. 24, lines 4-12, Rauer).

It would have been obvious to one ordinary skill in the data processing art, at the time of the present invention, to combine the teachings of the cited references because the change column of Rauer's teachings would have allowed to Norcott's system to create databases, loading and accessing data in the databases as suggested by Ruer, see col. 1, lines 46-47. Further, change column as taught by Rauer improves to perform set of commands to execute the creation of the aggregate tables (see col. 3, lines 19-20, Rauer).

As to claim 10,

Norcott teaches wherein the on-line transaction processing (OLTP) system are provided by different database vendors employing a different, incompatible internal implementation (The source of the data is an online transaction processing (OLTP) database and OLTP databases provide a mechanism for exporting [shipping] data from the database into a static file. The static file then loaded by the server process into the database table and enable the database to processes for update, see col. 4, lines 20-30, Norcott).

Conclusion

6. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** See MPEP

§ 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Contact Information

7. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Mohammad Ali whose telephone number is (571) 272-4105. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday (7:30 am-6:00 pm).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John E. Breene can be reached on (571) 272-4107. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).



Mohammad Ali
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 2167

MA
October 1, 2005